

REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-38 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled herein
- No claims are withdrawn herein
- Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 13, 23, and 30 are amended herein
- New claims 37 and 38 are added herein

[0011] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9 and 13 is found in the specification at least at page 5 lines 1-3 and at page 7, 2nd paragraph.

[0012] Claims 1 and 23 are amended herein as shown above, and explained below in the section entitled:

[0013] Furthermore, new claims 37 and 38 are fully supported by the Application, and therefore do not constitute new matter. Support for new claim 37 is found, at least, in claims 1-12, 23, and 25-36. Support for new claim 38 is found, at least, in claims 14-20. New claims 37 and 38 are allowable over the cited documents of record at least for the same reasons that claims 1-12, 14-20, 23, and 25-36 are allowable.

Claims 1-13 and 23-29 Comply With § 112 2nd Paragraph

[0014] Claims 1-13 and 23-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 2-13 and claims 24-29 are rejected due to their dependency

on, and inclusion of, the rejected subject matter of claims 1 and 23 respectively. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0015] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 23 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections moot.

Cited Documents

[0016] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Challapali:** *Challapali*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020194006**
- **Hyon:** *Hyon*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020077135**
- **Heikes:** *Heikes, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20030225848**
- **AllAlias.com:** "**MUST READ: Signature/Avatar Rules**", retrieved 6/7/2008 at <<http://web.archive.org/web/20031002014646/forums.allalias.com/index.php?>>>, *AllAlias.com*, May 23, 2003, pp 1-8
- **Chodor:** *Chodor, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020036990**
- **Hickman:** *Hickman, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. **7,013,327**
- **Dawson:** *Dawson*, U.S. Patent No. **6,252,588**
- **Day:** *Day, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20050027839**
- **Jilk:** *Jilk, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020010746**
- **Goodwin:** *Goodwin, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020065931**

- **Goldschneider:** *Goldschneider, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20020107925**
- **Huntington:** *Huntington, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **20030131098**
- **Zhao:** *Zhao*, U.S. Patent No. **7,353,253**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 33, 35, and 36 Are Non-Obvious Over Challapali in view of Hyon and further in view of Heikes

[0017] Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 33, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali in view of Hyon and further in view of Heikes. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0018] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 1 is obvious in view of the combination of Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes. Applicant submits that the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- **storing the emoticon pixel set in a custom emoticon object store;**
- **assigning a character sequence to the emoticon pixel set by the sender using a keyboard device, the character sequence representing the emoticon pixel set;**

- transmitting a **text message including the character sequence** to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the emoticon pixel set at the destination, **wherein both of the text message and the emoticon pixel set are displayed on a screen of the destination, the emoticon pixel set being substituted at the destination within the text message for the character sequence within the text message;**

[0019] Claim 1 recites in part, “storing the emoticon pixel set in a custom emoticon object store.” The Office states that, “Challapali is silent on creating an emoticon by the sender; storing the emoticon in a custom emoticon object store; the emoticon within the text message and both of text message and the emoticon are displayed on a screen; and establishing a real-time peer-to-peer link between the sender and the destination to retrieve the pixels from a storage medium associated with the sender,” (Office Action, page 4). The Office cites Heikes, Fig. 16, [0024], lines 4-6 and 14-16, [0074] lines 15-17 and [0097] as teaching this feature. (Office Action, pages 5). Heikes describes, “the IM sender system may have stored the corresponding personalization in a local memory or another local storage location, and the identifier may specify or be otherwise useful in determining the location at which the corresponding personalization item is stored.” (Heikes, [0097] lines 10-14).

[0020] It appears the Office is mapping “a local memory or another local storage location” as recited by Heikes [0097] with the “custom emoticon object store” as recited in claim 1. However, just “a local memory” or “another local storage location” appears to lack the particularity of “an object store” which “stor(es) custom emoticons,” as claim 1 recites. Furthermore, it would appear that the Office is equating “personalization item”

as recited by Heikes with the “emoticon pixel set” as recited by claim 1. However, these are also not the same. “Personalization items include images, such as wallpaper, that are rendered in a location having a contextual placement on a user interface,” (Heikes, [0024] lines 7-9). “Personalization items stored at the host include a graphic, such as an icon, a sound, wallpaper capable of being rendered on an instant messaging application user interface, an animation sequence, and a video segment,” (Heikes, [0006], lines 2-6). “An emoticon pixel set”, as recited by claim 1, is “creat(ed) by a pixel array generator by selecting a single set of pixels.”

[0021] Claim 1 goes on to recite, “assigning a character sequence to the emoticon pixel set by the sender using a keyboard device, the character sequence representing the emoticon pixel set.” The Office cites Challapali [0019] lines 5-8, [0021] lines 5-8, [0023] and [0025] lines 2-5 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 4). Challapali describes, “a visual speech system for converting emoticons into facial expressions on a displayable animated facial image.” (Challapali, abstract)

[0022] It appears the Office is equating “the character sequence representing the emoticon pixel set,” as recited in claim 1, with “the user sending the message can not only input words, but also input emoticon strings that will cause the animated image being displayed to incorporate facial expressions and emotions,” (Challipali, [0021] lines 2-5). However, “the character sequence” as recited in claim 1, is not the emoticon pixel set itself but a “represent(ation)” of “the emoticon pixel set,” which is “assign(ed) to the emoticon pixel set,” as claim 1 recites. Challipali’s emoticon strings, are actual emoticon strings, an example of which is provided by Challipali in paragraph [0023], line 6, “an angry emoticon string >:-<).”

[0023] Claim 1 further recites, “transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the emoticon pixel set at the destination, wherein both of the text message and the emoticon pixel set are displayed on a screen of the destination, the emoticon pixel set being substituted at the destination within the text message for the character sequence within the text message.” The Office cites Challapali Fig. 1, [0011], [0027] lines 1-3, [0019] lines 8-10, and [0020] lines 9-11 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 4). Challapali describes, “an online chat system having visual speech capabilities, comprising: (1) a first networked client having: (a) a first data import system for receiving text data that includes word strings and emoticon strings, and (b) a data export system for sending the text data to a network; and (2) a second networked client having: (a) a second data import system for receiving the text data from the network, and (b) a text-to-animation system for generating a displayable animated face image that reproduces facial movements corresponding to the received word strings and the received emoticon strings contained in the text data.” (Challapali, [0011]).

[0024] It appears the Office is equating, “transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the emoticon pixel set at the destination, wherein both of the text message and the emoticon pixel set are displayed on a screen of the destination,” as recited by claim 1, with “a data export system for sending the text data to a network...receiving the text data from the network,” as taught by Challapali [0011]. However, Challapali goes on to suggest, “a text-to-animation system for generating a displayable animated face image that reproduces facial movements corresponding to the received word strings and the received emoticon

strings contained in the text data.” (Challapali, [0011]) Challapali does not teach or suggest, “both of the text message and the emoticon pixel set are displayed on the screen of the destination,” as recited by claim 1. Challapali only teaches, “generating a displayable animated face image that reproduces facial movements.” (Challapali, [0011]). The “emoticon pixel set...displayed” as claim 1 recites, is not “converted to corresponding facial expressions,” as taught by Challapali [0027], but a “reconstruction of the emoticon pixel set at the destination” as recited by claim 1. And Challipali further suggests, “the inputted text data is converted into a remote audio-visual broadcast comprised of a moving animated face image that simulates speech. Therefore, rather than just receiving a text message, a user will receive a video speech broadcast containing the message.” (Challipali, [0020]). This is notably different from the recitation of claim 1: “transmitting a text message including the character sequence to a destination to allow for reconstruction of the emoticon pixel set at the destination, wherein both of the text message and the emoticon pixel set are displayed on a screen of the destination, the emoticon pixel set being substituted at the destination within the text message for the character sequence within the text message.”

[0025] Consequently, the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 6, 11 and 12

[0026] Claims 2, 4, 6, 11 and 12 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6, 11 and 12 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their

dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 14

[0027] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 14 is obvious in view of the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes. The Office states, "As to claims 14, 23 and 35, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above." (Office Action, page 11.)

[0028] Applicant points out that the Office failed to address the specific claim language of claim 14. The claim language of claim 14 is different from that of claim 1.

[0029] It is not that the Office disagreed about whether specific claim language distinguishes the claims from the cited references. Rather, it appears that the Office has not addressed with particularity whether the particular claim language of this claim distinguishes this claim from the cited references. The Office provides little to no explanation as to how the components of the cited references correspond to the actual claim language of this claim. Furthermore, the Office provides little or no explanation as to how the operation of components of the cited reference corresponds to that of the actual claim language of this claim.

[0030] Since the Office has provided little or no reasoning for its rejections, Applicant can do little more than gainsay. Applicant is forced to make assumptions and guesses as to the Office's specific reasoning. Therefore, Applicant submits that it has been denied its right to adequately and effectively respond to the Office's rejections.

[0031] In *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (CA FC 2002), the Federal Circuit explained the following on page 1433:

The Administrative Procedure Act, which governs the proceedings of administrative agencies [such as the Patent and Trademark Office] and related judicial review, establishes a scheme of "reasoned decisionmaking." Not only must an agency's decreed result be within the scope of its lawful authority, but the process by which it reaches that result must be logical and rational. Allentown Mack Sales and Service, Inc. v. National Labor Relations Bd., 522 U.S. 359, 374 (1998) (citation omitted).

This standard requires that the agency not only have reached a sound decision, but have *articulated the reasons for that decision*. The reviewing court is thus enabled to perform meaningful review within the strictures of the APA, for the court will have a basis on which to determine "whether the decision was based on the relevant factors and whether there has been a clear error of judgment." *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 416 (1971). [emphasis added]

[0032] Applicant submits that the Office has generally failed to articulate the reasons for its decision-making. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office withdraw finality and completely re-examine this claim and its dependents anew.

Independent Claim 21

[0033] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 21 is obvious in view of the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes. The Office states, "As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 1 and 6 above." (Office Action, page 11.)

[0034] Applicant points out that the Office failed to address the specific claim language of claim 21. The claim language of claim 21 is different from that of claims 1 and 6.

[0035] It is not that the Office disagreed about whether specific claim language distinguishes the claims from the cited references. Rather, it appears that the Office has not addressed with particularity whether the particular claim language of this claim

distinguishes this claim from the cited references. The Office provides little to no explanation as to how the components of the cited references correspond to the actual claim language of this claim. Furthermore, the Office provides little or no explanation as to how the operation of components of the cited reference corresponds to that of the actual claim language of this claim.

[0036] Since the Office has provided little or no reasoning for its rejections, Applicant can do little more than gainsay. Applicant is forced to make assumptions and guesses as to the Office's specific reasoning. Therefore, Applicant submits that it has been denied its right to adequately and effectively respond to the Office's rejections.

[0037] Applicant submits that the Office has generally failed to articulate the reasons for its decision-making. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office withdraw finality and completely re-examine this claim and its dependents anew.

Independent Claim 23

[0038] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 23 is obvious in view of the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes. The Office states that, "As to claims 14, 23 and 35, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above." (Office Action, page 11.)

[0039] Applicant points out that the Office failed to address the specific claim language of claim 23. The claim language of claim 23 is different from that of claim 1.

[0040] It is not that the Office disagreed about whether specific claim language distinguishes the claims from the cited references. Rather, it appears that the Office has not addressed with particularity whether the particular claim language of this claim distinguishes this claim from the cited references. The Office provides little to no

explanation as to how the components of the cited references correspond to the actual claim language of this claim. Furthermore, the Office provides little or no explanation as to how the operation of components of the cited reference corresponds to that of the actual claim language of this claim.

[0041] Since the Office has provided little or no reasoning for its rejections, Applicant can do little more than gainsay. Applicant is forced to make assumptions and guesses as to the Office's specific reasoning. Therefore, Applicant submits that it has been denied its right to adequately and effectively respond to the Office's rejections.

[0042] Applicant submits that the Office has generally failed to articulate the reasons for its decision-making. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office withdraw finality and completely re-examine this claim and its dependents anew.

Dependent Claims 24 and 25

[0043] Claims 24 and 25 ultimately depend from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 24 and 25 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 30

[0044] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 30 is obvious in view of the combination of the combination of Challapali, Hyon and Heikes. The Office states that, "As to claim 30, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 24 above." (Office Action, page 11.)

[0045] Applicant points out that the Office failed to address the specific claim language of claim 30. The claim language of claim 30 is different from that of claim 1.

[0046] It is not that the Office disagreed about whether specific claim language distinguishes the claims from the cited references. Rather, it appears that the Office has not addressed with particularity whether the particular claim language of this claim distinguishes this claim from the cited references. The Office provides little to no explanation as to how the components of the cited references correspond to the actual claim language of this claim. Furthermore, the Office provides little or no explanation as to how the operation of components of the cited reference corresponds to that of the actual claim language of this claim.

[0047] Since the Office has provided little or no reasoning for its rejections, Applicant can do little more than gainsay. Applicant is forced to make assumptions and guesses as to the Office's specific reasoning. Therefore, Applicant submits that it has been denied its right to adequately and effectively respond to the Office's rejections.

[0048] Applicant submits that the Office has generally failed to articulate the reasons for its decision-making. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office withdraw finality and completely re-examine this claim and its dependents anew.

Dependent Claims 31, 33, 35 and 36

[0049] Claims 31, 33, 35 and 36 ultimately depend from independent claim 30. As discussed above, claim 30 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 31, 33, 35 and 36 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claim 3 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of AllAlias.com

[0050] Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of AllAlias.com. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 3

[0051] Claim 3 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 3 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claims 5, 7, 26, 28, 29, and 32 Are Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor

[0052] Claims 5, 7, 26, 28, 29, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 5 and 7

[0053] Claims 5 and 7 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 5 and 7 are

also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claims 26, 28 and 29

[0054] Claims 26, 28 and 29 ultimately depend from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 26, 28 and 29 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claim 32

[0055] Claim 32 ultimately depends from independent claim 30. As discussed above, claim 30 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 32 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claims 8-10, 15, 16, 27, and 34 Are Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor, and further in view of Hickman

[0056] Claims 8-10, 15, 16, 27, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor, and further in view of Hickman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 8-10

[0057] Claims 8-10 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 8-10 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claims 15 and 16

[0058] Claims 15 and 16 ultimately depend from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 15 and 16 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claim 27

[0059] Claim 27 ultimately depends from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 27 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Dependent Claim 34

[0060] Claim 34 ultimately depends from independent claim 30. As discussed above, claim 30 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 34 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claims 8-10, 15, 16, 27, and 34 Are Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor, and further in view of Dawson

[0061] Claims 8-10, 15, 16, 27, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Chodor, and further in view of Dawson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 8-10

[0062] Claims 8-10 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 8-10 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claims 15 and 16

[0063] Claims 15 and 16 ultimately depend from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 15 and 16 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Dependent Claim 27

[0064] Claim 27 ultimately depends from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 27 is also allowable

over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Dependent Claim 34

[0065] Claim 34 ultimately depends from independent claim 30. As discussed above, claim 30 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 34 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. This claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 13 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Day

[0066] Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Day. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 13

[0067] Claim 13 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 13 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 17 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Jilk

[0068] Claims 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Jilk. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 17

[0069] Claim 17 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 17 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 18 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, Heikes, and Jilk, further in view of Goodwin

[0070] Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, Heikes, and Jilk, further in view of Goodwin. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 18

[0071] Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 18 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an

allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 19 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Jilk, further in view of Goldschneider, and further in view of Huntington

[0072] Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes, further in view of Jilk, further in view of Goldschneider, and further in view of Huntington. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 19

[0073] Claim 19 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 19 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 20 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, Heikes, Jilk, Goldschneider, and Huntington, and further in view of Zhao

[0074] Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, Heikes, Jilk, Goldschneider, and Huntington, and further in view of Zhao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 20

[0075] Claim 20 ultimately depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 20 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 22 Is Non-Obvious Over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes

[0076] Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Challapali, Hyon, and Heikes. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 22

[0077] Claim 22 ultimately depends from independent claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 22 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Conclusion

[0078] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/kaseychristie40559/

Dated: 09/10/2009

Kasey C. Christie
(kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)
Registration No. 40559